

Remarks

Claims 1-28 are pending in this application, claims 23-25 of which are withdrawn from consideration.

Although a number of paragraphs from the previous Office Action mailed July 25, 2006 are repeated from page 6 of that previous Office Action, these claims in those repeated paragraphs are not actually rejected in the present Office Action, and, in fact, claims 4, 11-19 and 26-28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant initially notes that claims 11, 16 and 26 are already in independent form. Applicant believes that those claims and their dependent claims are in condition for allowance and believes that the Examiner inadvertently failed to recognize that claims 11-19 and 26-28 are allowable in their present form. The Examiner is requested to reconsider and confirm applicant's understanding with regard to claims 11-19 and 26-28.

Although other claims are discussed in the Office Action, the only claims which stand rejected are claims 1-3 and 5-10 which are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) in view of the proposed combination of U.S. Patent 5,348,078 to Dushane and U.S. Patent 5,181,653 to Parker et al. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed for the reasons set forth as follows.

The rejection of claim 1 is traversed on the basis that the requirement of *"control circuits operably in communication with each other such that changing a temperature setpoint at any one of said multiple thermostats will change the temperature setpoint of all of said thermostats"* is not met. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Dushane fails to teach the control circuits in communication with one another such that changing the temperature at any one of the multiple thermostats changes the temperature at all of the thermostats. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of Parker et al. in that changing the temperature setpoint at any one of the thermostats of Parker et al. will not change the temperature setpoint at all of the thermostats. In making the rejection the Examiner relies on lines 40-50 of column 1. However, applicant submits that line 43 of column 1 recognizes that a thermostat must be in a master or a slave functional mode, and further submits that Parker et al. makes no disclosure regarding a slave thermostat having a capability to change other

thermostat setpoints. In column 10, lines 38-40 of Parker et al., Parker et al. specifically states that one thermostat is chosen as a master or monitor stat 15 and the other thermostats are slave stats 30-32. Applicant submits that no disclosure can be identified anywhere in Parker et al. to the effect that a slave thermostat will change the temperature setpoint of all or other thermostats in the system. Therefore, the requirement of claim 1 as quoted above cannot be met by Parker et al. and claims 1-3 and 5-10 are submitted to be novel and patentable in view of Parker et al.

Inasmuch as neither Parker et al. nor Dushane discloses the claim requirement quoted above, applicant submits that claim 1 is novel and patentable in view of the proposed combination of Parker et al. and Dushane, whether those references are taken individually or in combination.

The rejection of claims 6 and 10 are traversed for the same reasons that those claims were traversed in the previous Office Action mailed on December 8, 2006 and those claims are submitted to have independent novelty and patentability.

Additionally, the novelty and patentability of claim 8 is reiterated based on applicant's comments provided in the previous Office Action dated December 8, 2006.

With the foregoing comments and remarks, the issues raised in the Office Action are believed to be fully addressed and reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and objections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,



William O'Driscoll
Registration No. 33,294

Telephone Number: (608)787-2538
E-Mail Address: bodriscoll@trane.com